

**REMARKS**

Claims 8-20 were pending in the application. Claims 8 and 20 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Therefore, claims 8-20 remain pending and are resubmitted for consideration.

**I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 – Suhara**

Claims 8, 10, 12, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,260,260 (hereinafter “Suhara”). The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason.

**A. The Claims**

Independent claim 8 recites a component placement device that comprises:

an elongated transport device that is configured to transport a substrate in a transport direction parallel to the transport device; at least one component feeder that is located along a longitudinal side of the transport device; at least one component pick-and-place unit that is configured to: (a) pick-up a component from the at least one component feeder; and (b) place the component on the substrate; and at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction.

Independent claim 20 recites a component placement device that comprises:

an elongated transport device that is configured to transport a substrate in a transport direction parallel to the transport device; a component feeder that is located only on one longitudinal side of the transport device; at least one component pick-and-place unit that is configured to: (a) pick-up a component from the at least one component feeder; and (b) place the component on the substrate; and at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport device.

**B. Suhara**

Suhara does not teach or suggest a component placement device that comprises, among other things: “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction” (claim 8); or “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport device” (claim 20).

Suhara discloses an apparatus for supplying electronic components to a circuit board. The apparatus of Suhara includes a base 10 with a board supporting and positioning device 16, a printed circuit board 38, and an electronic component supplying apparatus 14. *See* Suhara at col. 12, lines 38-42. The board supporting and positioning device 16 includes a X-axis table 34 for supporting and moving the board 38 along the X-direction via guide rail 44. The device 16 also includes a Y-axis table 36 for supporting and moving the board 38 along the Y-direction via guide rails 50. *See* Suhara at col. 12, lines 42-46. The Y-axis table 36 is positioned on top of the X-axis table 34. *See* Suhara at Fig. 1. The supplying apparatus 14 includes supply units 260 and an electronic component mounting device 12. *See* Suhara at Fig. 1.

The supply units 260 of Suhara are positioned along a longitudinal side of the X-axis guide rails 44. *See* Suhara at Fig. 1. Suhara, however, does not disclose a substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport device. The board support 16 of Suhara is not “on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located,” as recited in claims 8 and 20. The board support 16, X-axis table 34, and Y-axis table 36 are positioned over and on both sides of the X-axis guide rails 44. *See* Suhara at Fig. 1. As can be seen in Figure 1 of Suhara, the X-axis table 34 is adjacent to the supply units 260 and the Y-axis table

36 can be positioned adjacent to the supply units 260 on either side of the X-axis guide rails 44. Therefore, the rejection of claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 10, 12, and 19 depend from claim 8 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

## **II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 – Suhara & Hashimoto**

Claims 9, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suhara in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,724,722 (hereinafter “Hashimoto”). Claims 9, 11, and 13 depend from claim 8. The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason.

Suhara and Hashimoto, taken together or separately, fail to teach or suggest a component placement device that comprises, among other things, “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction,” as recited in claim 8.

As stated above, Suhara does not disclose a component placement device that comprises a substrate support situated on only one longitudinal side of a transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located.

Hashimoto fails to cure the deficiencies of Suhara. Even if, assuming arguendo, Hashimoto teaches a substrate support that is detachably connected to the component placement device, or a guide profile that is connected to the substrate wherein the guide profile is configured to be moved together with the substrate support as suggested by the Examiner, the combination of Suhara and Hashimoto still fails to teach or suggest “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the

transport direction.” Thus, the rejection of claims 9, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

### **III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 – Suhara & Togami**

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suhara in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,855,059 (hereinafter “Togami”). Claim 14 depends from claim 8. The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason.

Suhara and Togami, taken together or separately, fail to teach or suggest a component placement device that comprises, among other things, “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction,” as recited in claim 8.

As stated above, Suhara does not disclose a component placement device that comprises a substrate support situated on only one longitudinal side of a transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located.

Togami fails to cure the deficiencies of Suhara. Even if, assuming arguendo, Togami teaches that the distance between the guides is adjustable as suggested by the Examiner, the combination of Suhara and Togami still fails to teach or suggest “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction,” as recited in claim 8. Thus, the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

**IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 – Suhara & Hata**

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suhara in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,778,525 (hereinafter “Hata”). Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 8. The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason.

Suhara and Hata, taken together or separately, fail to teach or suggest a component placement device that comprises, among other things, “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction,” as recited in claim 8.

As stated above, Suhara does not disclose a component placement device that comprises a substrate support situated on only one longitudinal side of a transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located.

Hata fails to cure the deficiencies of Suhara. Even if, assuming arguendo, Hata teaches a substrate support that is configured to be moved vertically from a position parallel to the transport device to a position underneath the transport device as suggested by the Examiner, the combination of Suhara and Hata still fails to teach or suggest “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction,” as recited in claim 8. Thus, the rejection of claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

**V. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 – Suhara & Hashimoto & Togami**

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suhara, in view of Hashimoto, and further in view of Togami. Claim 15 depends from claim 8. The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason.

Suhara, Hashimoto, and Togami, taken together or separately, fail to teach or suggest a component placement device that comprises, among other things, “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction,” as recited in claim 8.

As stated above, Suhara does not disclose a component placement device that comprises a substrate support situated on only one longitudinal side of a transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located.

Hashimoto and Togami fail to cure the deficiencies of Suhara. Even if, assuming arguendo, Hashimoto discloses a guide profile that is connected to the substrate wherein the guide profile is configured to be moved together with the substrate support and Togami discloses that the distance between the guides is adjustable as suggested by the Examiner, the combination of Suhara, Hashimoto, and Togami still fails to teach or suggest “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction,” as recited in claim 8. Thus, the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

**VI. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 – Suhara & Hashimoto & Nakashima**

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suhara, in view of Hashimoto, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,155,903 (hereinafter “Nakashima”). Claim 18 depends from claim 8. The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason.

Suhara, Hashimoto, and Nakashima, taken together or separately, fail to teach or suggest a component placement device that comprises, among other things, “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one

substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction,” as recited in claim 8.

As stated above, Suhara does not disclose a component placement device that comprises a substrate support situated on only one longitudinal side of a transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located.

Hashimoto and Nakashima fail to cure the deficiencies of Suhara. Even if, assuming arguendo, Hashimoto discloses a guide profile that is connected to the substrate wherein the guide profile is configured to be moved together with the substrate support and Nakashima discloses that the substrate support is configured to be moved vertically from a position parallel to the transport device to a position underneath the transport device as suggested by the Examiner, the combination of Suhara, Hashimoto, and Nakashima still fails to teach or suggest “at least one substrate support that is situated on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction,” as recited in claim 8. Thus, the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

## **VII. Conclusion**

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to

charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 5, 2008

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5349  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By   
Jessica M. Cahill  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 56,986